1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
2		SION - LOS ANGELES
3		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )	Case No. 20 MJ-3039
5	Plaintiff, )	Los Angeles, California Tuesday, July 7, 2020
6	v. )	1:00 P.M. to 1:27 P.M.
7	JONATHAN WILLIAM WALL, )	TELEPHONIC HEARING
8	Defendant. )	
9		
10		
11		
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE KAREN L. STEVENSON, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE.	
13		
14		
15	Appearances:	See Page 2
16	Deputy Clerk:	Gay Roberson
17	Court Reporter:	Recorded; CourtSmart
18	<del> </del>	JAMS Certified Transcription 16000 Ventura Boulevard #1010
19		Encino, California 91436 (661) 609-4528
20		
21		
22		
23		
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.	
_ ~	l state of the sta	

## LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, JULY 7, 2020, 1:00 P.M. 1 2 (Call to Order of the Court.) THE CLERK: Calling Case No. 20 MJ-3039, 3 United States of America v. Jonathan William Wall. 4 5 Counsel, please state your appearances for the 6 record. 7 CHARLES FOWLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Charles Fowler for the United States. 8 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Fowler. 10 JAMES A. BUSTAMANTE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. James Bustamante appearing on behalf of Mr. Jonathan William 11 Wall, who's present by way of video. 12 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon to you, Mr. Bustamante. And good afternoon to you, Mr. Wall, who is 14 15 appearing by video, per consent that was previously given at his initial appearance, and in custody. 16 17 This is the time that the Court had set for the 18 continued detention hearing in this matter and an identity 19 hearing in this matter, as that was not waived -- as this is 20 an out-of-district matter and Mr. Wall did not at his initial 21 appearance waive the right to an identity hearing, but I do 22 have a document signed on the 2nd, a waiver of identity 23 hearing. 24 Is that correct, Mr. Bustamante? 25

MR. BUSTAMANTE: That is correct, Your Honor.

did go through that with Mr. Wall. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to you, Mr. Wall. I just want to 3 4 confirm that you had a chance to go over the waiver of the 5 right to an identity hearing with your counsel, 6 Mr. Bustamante; is that right? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: And you did have an opportunity to consider what the consequences and implications were of 9 10 giving up that right; is that correct? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And it is your desire to give up your 12 right to have an identity hearing in this district in this 13 matter that originates out of the District Court of Maryland; 14 15 is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Then the Court finds that 18 your waiver of right to an identity hearing is knowing, 19 willingly, and voluntarily given. 20 Is the Government prepared to proceed with a detention hearing today? 21 22 MR. FOWLER: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And, Mr. Fowler, is the Government 24 still seeking detention in this matter? 25 MR. FOWLER: Yes, Your Honor, the Government is

seeking detention. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bustamante, is the defense prepared to go 3 forward with a detention hearing this afternoon? 4 5 MR. BUSTAMANTE: We are, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 Let me double-check because I do believe, based on 8 the charges out of the District of Maryland, this is a 9 presumption case. Is that correct, Mr. Fowler? 10 MR. FOWLER: Yes, Your Honor. It's a (b)(1)(A) quantity under Title 21, and it is a presumption case as a 11 12 result. 13 THE COURT: All right. In that instance, because the Government has the presumption -- a rebuttal presumption, 14 15 I'm going to allow the defense to argue first and addressing any risk of nonappearance and danger posed by Mr. Wall. 16 17 Mr. Bustamante, you may proceed. 18 MR. BUSTAMANTE: Thank you very much, Your Honor. 19 I want to start off by saying that the 20 Pretrial Services officer did a relatively thorough report. 21 So I'm going to do my best not to repeat anything that's 22 indicated in the report and -- but there are some important 23 factors that I do want to highlight and make sure that the record is clear to clarify the circumstances under which 24

Mr. Wall found himself self-surrendering on the warrant from

25

Baltimore, Maryland, last Monday, which I believe was the 31st.

MR. FOWLER: 29th.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: 29th -- whatever day last Monday was, Your Honor.

So, Your Honor, I was involved with Mr. Wall when this case first started last summer in Baltimore, Maryland. I had traveled -- I was retained by Mr. Wall, I traveled back East and met the AUSA Mr. Chris Romano, and I think there was, I think, eight or nine other defendants in this matter. It's basically an 846, 841(a) that my client is charged with, conspiracy with intent to distribute marijuana. We had an understanding -- and I want to let the Court know everything clearly about the chronology of events -- that Mr. Wall would not be arrested and we would wait for the indictment to come down and we would make our initial appearance on agreed-upon date sometime in the end of the summer, beginning of fall of 2019.

I was contacted by the AUSA, Mr. Romano, and I had lost contact with my client. Mr. Romano had given us a couple of dates for him to appear. At one point he picked a particular date. I flew back to Baltimore, Maryland. Along with my local counsel, we appeared. Mr. Wall was absent. We concede that. There's no dispute about that. And he --

THE COURT: Not only was he absent but he

apparently was in Guatemala for several months; is that correct, Counsel?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: That is correct, Your Honor. He was in another country, and I was going to get to that.

So he did not make that appearance. He was out of the country in Central America, resurfaced in terms of contact with me, and over many discussions we -- he finally decided that he wanted to come back, face the music, so to speak, and get the case rolling.

I was in communication with AUSA Mr. Romano and advised him that I was in the process of trying to get him back with that in -- I believe it was the beginning or middle of March, Your Honor, where the Guatemalan airport was shut down, and it was open on and off with a lot of restrictions -- I've got a long memo from one of my law clerks that starts off March 13th -- and finally really opens where major airlines are flying out of the country on a regular basis at least one time a week. We got on board, and we got an airline ticket for Mr. Wall. I communicated as soon as I confirmed, your Honor, that Mr. Wall was on the plane and en route to self-surrender. I had told Mr. Romano that that was -- my efforts were to get him back into their jurisdiction and put this case behind him.

He's 25 years old. No criminal history. There were some other reasons why he made the poor choice of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

leaving. He believed that at some point there may have been some people looking for him, and I want -- without saying anything on the record, Your Honor, I'll refer the Court to a particular paragraph of the Pretrial Services Report, where it reflects some efforts by my client in having met with the AUSA and other, I guess, previous counsel. My clerk is going to try and find that for me, and I'll --(Counsel confers with his clerk.) THE COURT: Well, Counsel, let me be clear here --MR. BUSTAMANTE: And so -- so the point --THE COURT: Pardon --MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- the point --THE COURT: Pardon me. MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- the point being that --THE COURT: Pardon me, Mr. Bustamante. I want you to be clear here. This Court is not litigating the merits of the underlying charges out of the District of Maryland. Court is only concerned --MR. BUSTAMANTE: I understand. THE COURT: -- here with those factors and facts that are part of the record at this juncture before this Court regarding any elements in this defendant's history or background that would mitigate any further risk of nonappearance, as he's already not appeared for one federal court proceeding, or otherwise mitigate any danger to any

person or the community in light of the seriousness of the allegations that are lodged against him.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Completely understood, Your Honor. But the context is, because of my communication with Mr. Romano over the last couple of days to try to reach an agreement that the constant -- and of course it's one of the main concerns for the Court -- is whether or not he's a flight risk given his history, and I was simply trying to put into context the circumstances under which he left and then the circumstances of which he returned --

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- because it's important for everybody to know that the whole purpose of his returning was of course to self-surrender, and we gave notice to the AUSA, Romano, that he was arriving on a particular flight, particular time, and he's ready to be arrested, which is what occurred.

So presently, his parents, who have been supportive of Mr. Wall throughout his life, obviously, and through some struggles that he had as a teen with some mental-health issues and some issues with drug addiction -- they have been supportive with him, and as the Pretrial Services Reports -- I've been in constant contact with him. They are prepared to do a signature bond. The Pretrial Services Report recommends 25,000. If the Court thinks that it's necessary to go higher

than that, they're prepared to do whatever is necessary in support of their son.

The context of what we'd like to have happen with Mr. Wall is to have him returned and have his parents be custodians. They live about two hours outside of Baltimore. He can reside there. He can attend either outpatient or inpatient treatment through a facility that we checked on. It's called the Ashley -- Father Martin Ashley Treatment Center. I know that Mr. Romano, the U.S. attorney back there in Maryland, had checked that out. Of course, it would have to be approved by Pretrial Services.

But what I'm trying to do, Your Honor -- and you don't know me, and it's the first time that I've appeared before you, but I'm not an 8:00 to 5:00 lawyer. I'm a true believer in my clients, I'm a true believer in the system of trying to turn people's lives around, and Mr. Wall, despite this mandatory-minimum ten-year case that he's got in front of him, is now prepared with some appropriate intervention, which simply is to treat his addiction to ketamine, to treat other anxiety issues that he has, to get his life back on board so he has an exit strategy for this case that he's -- that's looming over his head.

The Government, over my conversations, has repeatedly told me, "Well, Mr. Bustamante, how do we know he's not going to leave again?" You know, there's no one

that can predict that, but the circumstances under which he 1 2 voluntarily self-surrendered -- and the Government had told me over the last month or so "We want him to come back, 3 Mr. Bustamante, the sooner, the better," and now he's here, 4 5 and they're seeking detention. I can agree to disagree with 6 their position. I don't quite understand it. I do 7 understand that if he had left as a fugitive with a desire to never to return and never came back and they had to go and catch him by the marshals fugitive task force, I'd have more 10 of an uphill battle.

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I hope, Your Honor, that I'm addressing all the issues that the Court needs to take into consideration. There's security, and I understand that there's also a new option, rather than an ankle bracelet, but there's a -- I was told by Pretrial Services there's a service in your district that -- I don't know if it's in Maryland or not -- where the person has a face-recognition app on his phone, where he can be checked on a regular basis, and it also has GPS because it's attached to a phone. So, if the Court wants additional conditions to address the Court's concern about flight risk, there's -- I don't need to tell the Court, of course, there's many options available to the Court.

In terms of danger to the community, he has issues that revolve around his behavior that's destructive to himself. It's not to society. He's -- he needs treatment.

He's not -- you -- the Court knows he's not going to get it the Santa Ana County Jail, he's not going to get it, you know, making his way from California to Baltimore, Maryland, over the course of who knows how long it would take and being exposed to COVID-19 along the way if he was detained.

I'm hoping, Your Honor, that I'm addressing all the issues that the Court needs to take under consideration to let him get back on track, have some consideration that he did self-surrender, and he's ready to move forward.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bustamante.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Fowler, for the Government?

MR. FOWLER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

Let me just begin by making clear, you know, for the record that the supplement that Pretrial provided to the Court and to the parties yesterday does change its recommendation from its initial report last week, which, as Mr. Bustamante said, recommended release on a \$25,000 appearance bond. Pretrial now has concluded that no set of conditions can reasonably assure the defendant's appearance, and so I just -- I wanted to direct the Court to that recommendation, which, of course, the Government agrees with.

I'll just touch briefly on danger, Your Honor. The defendant is accused of a very sophisticated drug-trafficking conspiracy involving over a thousand pounds -- sorry --

kilograms of marijuana. It's a serious offense distributing illegal drugs to the community, on top of the defendant's admitted drug problems, and just for those reasons, I don't think the defendant has rebutted the presumption that any set of conditions could reasonably assure the safety of the community.

But obviously, the main issue in this is the flight risk. It's simply undisputed that the defendant has already failed to appear once when faced with the very charges that he faces in this case. The Government doesn't really take issue with the timeline -- the basic timeline that was laid out by Mr. Bustamante, but the fact remains that, if you accept the defendant's information provided to Pretrial that he had been living in Guatemala for about seven months, it lines up -- it essentially lines up with the time when the defendant knew in late summer that he was going to be indicted and that an initial appearance was going to be scheduled, and the defendant fled the country so as not to face these charges.

It's true, Your Honor, that the defendant arranged, then, a self-surrender, but that's only after a number of months of being a fugitive out of the country. He fled the charges. He's got significant international travel. He's obviously got access to resources that have allowed him to travel in this way, and at the end of the day, Your Honor,

we're talking about an individual who, unfortunately, is facing, you know, serious ten-year mandatory-minimum charges as his sort of first exposure to the criminal justice system, which creates sort of an obvious pressure not to want to face that, which he's always demonstrated a willingness to do, and so, Your Honor, the Government thinks it's, likewise, not been -- not -- the defendant has not rebutted the presumption, again, of a reasonable assurance that he would not appear.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Any further comments from defense counsel?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Your Honor, I'll just add that all the potential conditions available to the Court to address what, I think, is probably the biggest looming concern as a flight risk are all circumstances that were not available back in the summer of 2019 and were not conditions and considerations considered by Mr. Wall when he made the poor -- the poor choice -- you know, there's no way that I'm going to try to excuse that particular choice, but there has to be something to be said, Your Honor, that, when the Government says, you know, "Get him back here. Get him back here as soon as possible," and he actually does come back, and he's been advised by me that, if he were to be released and leave this time with all of those conditions imposed, not only would his parents be subjected to the Government going after

them for whatever it be -- 25,000, 50,000, 100,000 -- that he would also face an additional charge on top of the 846, 841 that he's now facing, and I don't know any court that would impose that as a -- not -- an additional amount of exposure that would be imposed on top of whatever happens on the 846, 841(a).

So we have different circumstances and, Your Honor, you know, I don't know -- you know, actions speak louder than words. Here he is. We self-surrendered. I let them know he was coming. For him to -- for the suggestion that he's coming, to then turn around and leave, what's the point of that?

So I'm hoping Your Honor, that with all of the resources and conditions available to the Court there are the least restrictive of conditions that may be imposed by the Court to address the question of flight risk, because I don't think that danger to the community given the opportunities available for him and the support and the intervention now ready to go on his behalf, I would suggest that, I guess, the question for the Court is more about flight risk than it is danger to the community, I think, but —

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I'm happy to answer any questions the Court may have.

THE COURT: I don't have any further questions at

this moment.

Having heard the statements and arguments of counsel, the Court remains deeply concerned regarding the risk of flight. We have an individual who has no ties to the Central District of California, has no employment in the Central District of California, has had no presence in the Central District of California, and was present in Guatemala for the past seven months. It would be different if the Court were imposing conditions on an individual who was to appear here in the Central District. However -- and this is an out-of-district matter, where he must appear in the District of Maryland and has a previous failure to appear here.

In this presumption case, while the Court is mindful that under the current circumstances Mr. Wall has cooperated with his counsel to self-surrender and return to the United States, nevertheless, he has yet to appear in the charging jurisdiction, and the Court finds that the defendant has not rebutted by sufficient evidence to the contrary the presumption in this case regarding the risk of flight.

While the risk of danger is more -- danger to any person or the community is largely predicated on the seriousness of the charges in the case, and those charges are yet unproven, the Court also remains concerned -- has a concern for danger to any person or the community in the

interim of -- between the Central District of California, where he has no ties, to the charging District of Maryland because of his substance abuse. I believe Pretrial Services indicated that he had last used ketamine, a very serious drug, just days before his arrest.

Therefore, the Court is going --

THE DEFENDANT: That's not --

THE COURT: -- the Court is going to enter an order of detention in this matter as follows:

On a motion of the Government in a case allegedly involving narcotics or controlled-substance offense with a maximum sentence of ten or more years, on a motion by the Government in a case allegedly involving a serious risk that the defendant will flee, the Government is in this case entitled to a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance as required and the ability of any person — and the safety of any person or the community.

The Court finds that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendants as required and/or the safety of any person or the community, and the Court finds, as I indicated, that the defendant has not rebutted by sufficient evidence to the contrary the presumption that is provided by statute in this case.

In making that determination, the Court has considered the nature and circumstances of the offense charged; the weight of the evidence against the defendant, although that's the least weighty factor, those charges are yet unproven; the history and characteristics of the defendant; and the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or to the community.

The Court has also considered all of the evidence adduced at the hearing today and the arguments and statements of counsel, as well as the Pretrial Services Reports that were prepared in this case and its recommendation.

The Court bases the foregoing findings on the following:

The history and characteristics of the defendant indicate a serious risk that the defendant will flee because the risk of flight is presumed in this case.

The defendant is unemployed with little or no ties to this district.

The defendant's criminal record reflects prior failure -- a prior failure to appear, and insufficient bail resources have been proffered to mitigate the risk of flight.

The defendant also poses a risk to the safety of other persons or the community because of a history of drug use and the serious -- the nature and seriousness of the allegations in this presumption case.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Therefore, it is ordered that the defendant be detained prior to trial. It's further ordered that the defendant be committed to custody of the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. It's further ordered that the defendant be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with his counsel. And it is further ordered that on an order of a court of the United States or on a request of any attorney for the Government the person in charge of the corrections facility in which the defendant is confined shall deliver the defendant to a United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding. Mr. -- that is the Court's order of detention. Mr. Bustamante, would you also like the Court to order a transfer forthwith to the charging District of Maryland? MR. BUSTAMANTE: That's exactly what I was just going to ask, Your Honor --THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- and I appreciate the Court

bringing that to the attention of the record, and I would ask

that that be ordered.

THE COURT: The Court will so order that the defendant be transferred forthwith to the charging

District of Maryland, and that way his travel arrangements will all be sorted.

Now, of course, Mr. Bustamante, this order of detention is subject to review. You may seek review of that order upon his arrival with the charging district in Maryland should they determine that they're circumstances are such that they would be willing to consider a bond, but that is the determination of this Court.

Mr. Wall, I do believe you wish to address the Court, but, however, I want to caution you that I would really encourage you to speak to Mr. Bustamante. I wouldn't want you to say anything in court. You have a right to remain silent. I don't want you to say anything in the court that would in any way jeopardize your defense in this matter before you address the Court in any way.

Mr. Bustamante, do you have a secure line where you could speak to your client if there's something he wants you to bring to the Court's attention?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I do have a secure line but I -- just hearing the snippet of what he was about to say, I anticipate that it might have been a correction about --

THE COURT: From the Pretrial --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- the last time that he had used
ketamine, and in the greater scheme of things, I just want to
let the Court know that I recognize, and I'm letting client,
Mr. Wall, know, that that detail, whether correct or
incorrect in terms of whether it was a couple days or a week,
is of no great consequence in terms of what the Court has
ordered. So I'm hoping that my client, as I instructed him
previously, has nothing further to add.
          THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bustamante,
for that clarification. I appreciate that.
          All right. Anything further on this matter on
detention today?
          MR. FOWLER: Not from the Government, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: All right. Anything --
          MR. BUSTAMANTE: No, Your Honor, and -- no,
Your Honor. Thank you for the Court's consideration.
          THE COURT: My pleasure.
          I just want to make sure we have put on the record
that Mr. Wall -- I -- do we have a consent to appear
telephonically? I want to make sure we have it. I have his
Advisement of Statement of Rights, the waiver --
          MR. BUSTAMANTE: We had previously, Your Honor --
when we had our last hearing last week, we provided the Court
with a consent for --
          THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
1
              MR. BUSTAMANTE: -- videoconferencing.
 2
    sure if the Court wants another one for today's appearance or
    that covers both.
 3
              THE COURT: It has a form where you -- on that form
 4
 5
    it allows you to consent to detention hearings and further
 6
   proceedings; so we don't have to have a separate one. I just
 7
    don't happen to see it in the file this afternoon. Is it on
    the docket?
 8
 9
              MR. BUSTAMANTE: We can resend it to your clerk,
10
   Your Honor, if you'd like.
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bustamante, no need to
11
    resend another -- our courtroom deputy has confirmed that it
12
13
    is on the docket, which is what matters. So we have it, and
    it is signed.
14
15
                               Thank you.
              MR. BUSTAMANTE:
16
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much,
17
   Mr. Fowler, Mr. Bustamante.
18
              And good afternoon and good luck to you, Mr. Wall.
19
              MR. BUSTAMANTE: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
              MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
              THE CLERK: Court is adjourned.
22
         (Proceedings adjourned at 1:27 p.m.)
23
    ///
    ///
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Transcriber